DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 651 CG 010 155

AUTHOR	Rovner-Pieczenik, Roberta
TITLE	Project Crossroads as Pre-Trial Intervention. A Program Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	National Committee for Children and Youth, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Special Manpower Programs.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	47p.; For related documents, see ED 048 445 and 055 155; Not available in hard copy due to reproducibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Services; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Interagency Cooperation; Manpower Development; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Rehabilitation Programs; Young Adults; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Crossroads

ABSTRACT

This report describes and evaluates Project Crossroads, a manpower approach to the rehabilitation of accused offenders prior to adjudication. In order to demonstrate the feasibility of working with the court and its personnel to provide a pretrial intervention alternative for youthful first-time offenders, Project Crossroads provided a community-based program of manpower services to young men and women in the pretrial stage of the criminal court process. Project services include counseling, job placement, job training and remedial education. The report evaluates Project Crossroads in relation to its impact on the court adjudication of its participants, measurable results in the spheres of participant recidivism and employment, and evaluation of the characteristics of project participants who achieve success by Project Crossroads standards. The report discusses the role of this program of intervention in mitigating some negative byproducts of routine case processing, and makes recommendations concerning further program use and evaluation. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113651

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROJECT CROSSROADS AS PRE-TRIAL INTERVENTION

A PROGRAM EVALUATION

By

ROBERTA ROVNER-PIECZENIK
Criminologist; Ph.D. Candidate, New York University
Coordinator Law Forums, White House Conference on Children 1970
Former Instructor of Sociology: Fairfield University, Hunter College

Contract #82-34-68-15

CG 010 155

DECEMBER 1970

JUL 31 1975

PROJECT CROSSROADS STAFF

Leon G. Leiberg, Project Director

Joseph A. Trotter, Jr., Assistant Director

James H. Davis, Supervisor, Court Services

Frederick L. Hill, Senior Job Development Officer

Daniel S. Little, Manpower Specialist

Norman C. Baptist, Senior Community Worker

Suzanne I. Simmons, Community Worker

Roosevelt McIlwain, Community Worker

Randall B. Moore, Community Worker

Leonard H. Logan, Community Worker

Glenn R. Graham, Job Development Officer

B. Shelton Givens, Job Development Officer

Alfred E. Warren, Community Worker

Montrose M. Johnson, Secretary

Sylvia P. Jeter, Secretary

CONSULTANTS

Roberta Pieczenik, Sociologist:
"Program Evaluation"

John F. Holahan, Economist:
"Cost-Benefit Analysis"

VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA (VISTA)

Jon Gabel
John Krell
Eugene McCabe
Antonio Modica
Paul Nurick
James R. Steel
Sally Waldron

EDITOR: Joseph A. Trotter, Jr.

3/4

This report on a special manpower project was prepared under Contract Number 82-34-68-15 with the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Organizations undertaking such projects under Federal Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in this report.

Copyright National Committee for Children and Youth, 1971.
Reproduction in whole or in part permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Foreword

An essential element in any experimental and demonstration (E & D) effort is the evaluation and analysis of what has taken place. The interpretation of the facts and materials gathered is particularly important when policy decisions are being made. The impact of the services on participants, their reactions and achievements must be recorded and evaluated clinically as well as the limitations that become apparent, whatever they may be, if the effort is to have meaning. This is a difficult task in any project and requires not only academic qualifications but also the ability to work with and understand people of widely differing backgrounds and orientation. We were fortunate in being able to include such a person as a member of our team.

The study written by Mrs. Roberta Rovner-Pieczenik raises questions, suggests actions, and makes a valuable contribution to the knowledge we must possess if we wish to better understand the dynamic factors underlying the economically motivated law violations of youthful offenders. They relate to the employment problems, job expectations and the desire of youth to become useful and productive, a goal increasingly difficult to achieve for those without resources and lacking the supportive assistance of interested persons at a critical time in their life.

Leon G. Leiberg
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword		v
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT	3
	Record Keeping	3
	Selection of Crossroads Sample	4
	Follow-up Information	5
	Control Sample Selection	5
	Statistical Significance	6
	Summary	6
III.	PROJECT IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT	7
	The Project Participant--A Profile	7
	The Employment Variable	9
	Employment at Project Termination	9
	Employment After Termination	12
	Summary	14
IV.	PROJECT IMPACT ON RECIDIVISM	15
	Note on First Offender Adult Status	15
	Disposition of Original Charge for Adult Sample	15
	Adult Recidivism	17
	Juvenile Recidivism	19
	Summary	20
V.	"PREDICTING" SUCCESS IN CROSSROADS	21
	Indicants of Favorable Project Termination	21
	Indicants of Recidivism	24
	Recidivism of the Favorably Terminated	29
	Summary	31
VI.	IMPLICATIONS OF PROJECT FINDINGS	33
	The Research Component	33
	The Employment Component	35
	The Counseling Service	35
	Differential Services	38
	Conclusion	39

I. INTRODUCTION

Statistically, crime in society increases each year. The criminal justice system, faced with crime it hasn't prevented and criminals it hasn't deterred, has proven limited in its ability to respond with speed, flexibility and relevance to the increased demand on its services. Juvenile and adult courts, already overburdened with the task of dispensing "justice" on a daily basis, represent one focal point in the administration of justice at which innovative experimentation should be encouraged.

Three years ago, in 1967, few alternatives were available to the courts in Washington, D.C., for the handling of criminally accused individuals--other than processing them, according to statute, from initial hearing to final disposition. Since then, Project Crossroads has experimented with and demonstrated the feasibility of working with the court and its personnel to provide a pre-trial intervention alternative for youthful first-time offenders. As a manpower approach to the rehabilitation of accused offenders prior to adjudication, a variety of intensive pre-trial manpower services was offered to approximately 800 participants.

Phase I of Project Crossroads bore the responsibility for:

1. Working with and obtaining the acceptance, support and cooperation of the police-court system in Washington, D.C., for a joint endeavor.

2. Utilizing "new careers" personnel as line staff: paraprofessionals, individuals with previous criminal records, community volunteers, VISTA volunteers.

3. Maintaining ongoing relationships with other social supportive services in the area, to achieve a coordinated attack on problems of employment, education, welfare, etc.

A descriptive summary of the project, including problems encountered and recommendations for future projects, is found in the Final Report for Phase I. Phase II, which continued project operations for another year and a half, was charged with the responsibility of providing an assessment of the impact of the project's services on its participants, specifically in the areas of recidivism and employment. The present paper attempts to provide such an assessment by analyzing quantitative information gathered in the course of project operations.

Project Crossroads, working closely with both the Juvenile Court and Court of General Sessions, provided a 90-day community-based program of manpower services--including counseling, job placement, job training and remedial education--to young men and women in the pre-trial stage of the criminal court process. Project participants had to meet the general criteria of:

1. 16 to 26 years of age,

2. no prior conviction record in that court,

3. unemployed, underemployed and/or tenuously employed or school enrolled,

4. charged with a crime specifically defined and accepted by both the court and the project.

The court, in supporting this endeavor, agreed to consider a "nol pros" of the charges pending against any project participant who was terminated with a favorable recommendation by the project after the successful completion of the three-month program. Alleviation of congested court calendars and flexibility in case processing were foreseen as relatively immediate benefits by the introduction of a pre-trial diversion program into the District of Columbia court system. Longer-range benefits anticipated, in addition to the reduction of costs incurred in the prosecution, detention, trial and incarceration of individuals 'processed' in the usual manner, included altering the image of the courts in the eyes of the accused and the community. It was the hope of all concerned that the court, in its willingness to aid the individual by providing him with a non-punitive opportunity for rehabilitation, would come to be viewed as an institution interested in the individual and oriented toward the treatment approach to crime prevention. The participant, for his part, was provided an alternative to a permanently recorded label of "delinquent" or "criminal," as well as an avenue through which to gain a foothold in the legitimate opportunity structure of society. Society and the community, of course, would benefit from more and better equipped men and women in its labor force as well as from a decrease in the number of potential recidivists. In short, the opportunity for mitigating some negative by-products of present-day routine case processing and replacing them with a relevant program of intervention and rehabilitation was seen as advantageous to all concerned.

Although sufficient time has not elapsed for a full assessment of long-term goals, the present paper explores the following questions:

1. What impact has Project Crossroads made on the court adjudication of its participants?

2. What are the measureable results of Project Crossroads in the spheres of participant recidivism and employment?

3. What are the characteristics of project participants who achieve "success" by Project Crossroads standards?

According to the April 1970 Report of the President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation, a need was stated for programs which could divert an offender from adjudication and incarceration. Specific recommendations of the Task Force included:

1. Community facilities to provide pre-adjudication services to defendants and information about defendants to prosecutors and judges, with the object of diverting as many defendants as possible from the full criminal process;

2. An experimental program to determine the effectiveness of pre-trial counseling and supervision of defendants, and of deferred adjudication of certain defendants.

The report also endorsed the community-based program and the use of ex-offenders as staff for these programs.

Project Crossroads, under a grant from the Manpower Administration in 1968, began implementation of some of these recommendations to the President. The present paper utilizes quantitative data abstracted from case records in an attempt to evaluate one pre-trial diversion program. Statistics utilized in this report suffer all the limitations of court and police statistics. Furthermore, this type of analysis exaggerates the importance of variables which are readily quantifiable, at the expense of more qualitative information. Throughout, the purposes of an experimental and demonstration project must be kept in mind--and these differ markedly from the pure research undertaking.

II. THE METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT

The Research Component

In order to quantitatively assess the impact of Project Crossroads, a research consultant was added to the staff four months into Phase II of project operations.[1] Her task was to familiarize herself with the project in order to propose the necessary steps to be taken prior to program evaluation. To accomplish this, time was spent observing the daily activities of the staff and interviews were conducted with all staff members. Existing data recording and retrieval techniques were surveyed. An assessment of the project was proposed after the researcher felt she understood the project's philosophy, grasped the program on an operational level, and caught the "feeling" of the office.

Unfortunately, the introduction of the researcher at this late point in project operations resulted in some staff suspicion and resentment. The suspicion appeared related to the staff's concern that the researcher had been hired to "check up" on their work habits. Resentment was incurred with staff realization that the use of revised--and in some cases additional--data-recording forms "imposed" by an outsider would increase their workload. Although most of the staff were in agreement with the research purpose and the need for an evaluation and assessment of the project, they agreed only reluctantly to alter some of their procedures. All changes instituted were worked out only after close consultation and compromise between the staff and the researcher. The late date prohibited anything but minor alterations in data recording and gathering.

The racial difference between the researcher and the overwhelming majority of the staff did not appear to pose problems for the research task, nor was any posed by the limited verbal and literary skills of some of the paraprofessional staff. The major problem encountered was the manner and timing of the introduction of the research component into the project. Recommendations for building the research component into future projects will be discussed in the last section of this report.

Record Keeping

The initial review of data-recording forms utilized by the staff revealed some deficiencies in relevant information and a lack of coordination in information across staff divisions. Of necessity, keeping in mind the limitations of time, the purpose of an experimental and demonstration project, and the problems inherent in the late introduction of the research component, all changes in forms were kept to a minimum and represented compromises between the staff and the researcher.

The Intake Record, a detailed background information questionnaire administered during a participant's initial counseling interview, was left in its original form. The participants' Employment and Job Placement record was revised to more readily reflect changes in a participant's employment status as well as fluctuations in the job market. A Participation Termination Form was initiated to summarize project services rendered the participant during his tenure with the project. A Participant's Evaluation Form was developed for the purpose of viewing the project through the eyes of the recipient of its services. In addition, weekly and monthly supervisors' reports were more finely detailed. The most significant change, for evaluative purposes, was the revision of the project's Follow-Up Interview Form.

In retrospect, after use over a seven month period, some forms have proven more workable than others. Their major improvement over preceding ones was that they were more directed towards the goals and questions of a final evaluation. The major problems uncovered in attempting to institute change at such a late date were the staff's perception

[1] Phase I of the project ran from January 1968--May 1969; Phase II from May 1969--September 1970.

of their role as being people-oriented and not paper-oriented (although this dichotomy is not an absolute one), and their belief that qualitative experiences cannot be transformed into quantitative data. To overcome these problems in future projects, researchers must work closely with program staff from the start of the project.

Ironically, most of the data utilized in this report have been taken from "old" forms. Since the final evaluation had to be completed by project termination in September 1970, the requisite follow-up data could be collected only on those participants who were enrolled in Project Crossroads during Phase I and the early months of Phase II. The submission of a final report two or three months after project termination would have altered this situation considerably.

Selection of the Crossroads Sample

The data on which the assessment of Project Crossroads is based was taken from a systematic sampling of closed case files. An important determinant of the sampling timeframe was whether follow-up information was available for at least a six month period after Crossroads termination. For both the adult and juvenile sample, case sampling began with participants who entered the program shortly after its inception, and sampling concluded at the mid-point of Phase II. In all, a sample of 157 adult participants and 123 juvenile participants was drawn; these numbers represent 34% of the adult population and 42% of the juvenile population. These sample sizes were considered large enough to permit anticipated stratification by relevant variables (e.g., sex, age, status on termination from the project). Since a stratified sampling technique was not employed at the outset, the adult sample drawn was compared ex-post facto with the adult population on proportions of favorably and unfavorably terminated participants--a variable of importance in later calculations. The adult sample contains a slightly lower proportion of favorably terminated participants (as compared to the total project adult group), which has the effect of lending a conservative estimate to positive findings within the body of the report. A similar comparison for the juvenile sample was not undertaken, since a policy decision had been made not to quantitatively evaluate the juvenile component of the project.

After sample selection, a code was devised for abstracting data from the case record forms. The coded information was then transferred to IBM punch cards and appropriate questions were put to the computer.

Adult Sample

An original adult sample of 157 was selected by taking every second case involved with the project between September 1968 and November 1969. The statistics which follow, however, are based solely on a follow-up group of 134, taken from the original 157, each of whom had been terminated from the project for at least six months. Computer runs comparing the original sample with the follow-up sample showed them to be similar on major variable distributions. Although this final sample has the bias of including only those participants who were reached for a follow-up interview (which might appear as a favorable bias for the project), the fact that the sample includes a higher proportion of unfavorably terminated participants than is present in the population tends to negate this bias.

Juvenile Sample

The decision was made by the project director that case information on a juvenile sample--other than recidivism information--would not be coded and assessed. Problems encountered in working with the Juvenile Court, as well as in the labor market, accounted for this decision and are discussed elsewhere in the final report.

Follow-Up Information

Adults

Follow-up interviews on the adult sample were conducted at approximately three-month intervals for one year after project termination--in theory. In fact, some participants were contacted for their first follow-up anywhere between three and twelve months after termination. Although this does not necessarily bias the results, the follow-up methodology employed forced the researcher to abandon plans for chronological trends.

While it was felt by the project counselors that most of the information requested on the follow-up interview was of a non-threatening nature, and as such the validity of the responses would not be questionable, the decision was made to omit a question on rearrest and to check recidivism through the files of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department. Unfortunately, information on dispositions was not readily available from police records, nor was there the means of checking nearby districts of Maryland and Virginia for offenses committed outside of Washington city boundaries.

Many of the follow-up interviews were conducted by anyone who had knowledge of the participant. While the use of VISTA volunteers for this task was expedient, this approach always runs the risk of lowering the validity and reliability of responses.

Juveniles

Follow-up recidivism information for a systematically selected sample of juvenile participants was obtained from the Research Division of the Juvenile Court in Washington, D.C. Arrest histories were traced for a year after project termination; those individuals who turned 18 years of age were checked in the adult police files.

Control Sample Selection

A control sample of adult and juvenile offenders was selected as a yardstick against which project participants could be compared. The control samples were taken from court records using the same criteria utilized to select Crossroads participants: age, charge, and first offender status. Since this sample was not chosen along with the participant population, selection was from records of individuals who were eligible between one and six months before the project began. Geographical mobility coupled with false and incomplete information on court records made it impossible to locate these individuals. The only information possible to gather on this sample turned out to be information on recidivism--through official police records. It is the researcher's opinion that if a control sample is considered relevant to future projects of this nature, forethought is necessary in its selection and follow-up.

Adult Control

The records maintained by the D.C. Bail Agency were considered most relevant for the purpose of selecting an adult control group. They included information necessary for control sample selection and were stored to facilitate selection. A control sample of 107 accused offenders was selected systematically from all offenders seen by the court one to six months prior to Crossroads who met project acceptance criteria. A drawback in selection by this method was that only group similarities exist in comparing the control and project samples. On the other hand, there is no reason to believe that this group, coming into the courts earlier than project commencement, differed on any significant variable from the participants.

Adjudication and disposition information on the original charge was taken from the register of the clerk's office in the Court of General Sessions. Recidivism was checked through the police department in the same manner as for project participants.

An ex-post facto stratification of the control sample revealed too few 18- and 19-year olds in comparison with the participant sample. Since age appears to play an important role in participant recidivism--not realized until after assessment of the data--our control group might well have been stratified on this variable beforehand.

Juvenile Control

The decision to exclude a complete quantitative analysis of the juvenile participants limited data collection for juvenile controls. In order to compare recidivism rates, the Research Division of the Juvenile Court, using a systematic sampling technique, selected a group of 123 accused delinquents who appeared before the court between one and six months prior to project commencement and who fit project criteria for enrollment. As was the case for project participants, case records were checked for a period of 15 months, going into adult records when necessary.

Statistical Significance

The data reported in the body of this paper have been subjected to tests of statistical significance (chi-square). It was found that the decrease in participant recidivism over a 15-month period and the increase in steady employment and wages over the same period were of statistical significance (to the .05 level). Thus, Project Crossroads appears to have been successful not only in proving its concept operationally feasible but also in producing socially significant changes.

Exactly why these changes resulted is difficult to determine. Many of the variables which are related to success in the project are overlapping and appear in clusters. For example, increased age is related to success; but steady employment is related to age. Thus, a constellation of overlapping social variables--and the exclusion of others which might prove relevant--result in findings difficult to interpret via statistical tests. Whenever warranted, though, simple cross-tabulations were made in an attempt to understand the clustering effect. It was felt that a multivariate analysis necessitated a larger sample than was drawn.

It is the researcher's opinion that social policy planning for future projects similar to Crossroads should not necessarily be based upon the results of statistical tests. For example, whether or not test results prove significant, the fact that an increase in wage occurred, from $1.75 to $2.25 per hour for successful participants, has meaning from a planning point of view. While the tests were applied to the data as a routine evaluative measure, their value for program planning is, at best, unclear.

SUMMARY

The experimental and demonstration aspects of Project Crossroads have been reviewed in previous reports. The addition to the staff of a research consultant during Phase II of project operations was to provide for the assessment of quantitative data in the areas of court adjudication, recidivism and employment. This entailed an ex-post facto construction of a design for evaluation which would attempt to answer questions initially posed by the project. The analysis which follows assesses selected areas of program operation and highlights implications of this program for future efforts.

III. PROJECT IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT

The Project Participant--A Profile

The researcher has decided to avoid a lengthy discussion of the characteristics of the project's participants, per se, except where they are relevant to the project's evaluation. There is little doubt that in many ways Washington is similar in its social, economic, health, education, and crime problems to most other large American cities--compounded by issues of race and politics. In reference to crime and delinquency, in particular, the etiology of such behavior has been speculated upon and researched by everyone from social scientists to geneticists. Yet, it is interesting that very little space in the concluding volume of the President's Report on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice is devoted to the accused offender; little more than reference to the poverty of the courts' "clients."[2]

The little information on the accused given us by The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society[3] cites the city offender of street crimes as overwhelmingly male, black and living in an urban slum. The findings of Project Crossroads are essentially in agreement with this statement. Other characteristics of Washington, D.C., offenders accepted into the project are found in Table 1.

A reading of Table 1 reveals that most project participants, in addition to being male, black, and below 20 years of age, were born in Washington, D.C. Thus, an explanation of present date crime that attempts to place the burden of responsibility on recent migrants appears to be no more than myth for Washington, D.C. The relatively small number of high school graduates is also a revealing statistic. Although approximately 25% of our sample were still enrolled in school, not all could be expected to complete high school. Thus, the typical participant criminal offender is the high school dropout. The large number of accused individuals who are neither employed nor students (approximately 39%) at time of project enrollment tells us about the high proportion of "detached" individuals in the city. We shall note in a later section that many of these comprise the 18- and 19-year old age group.

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE OF PROJECT CROSSROADS ADULT PARTICIPANTS ENROLLED BETWEEN SEPTEMBER, 1968 AND NOVEMBER, 1969

CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENT OF SAMPLE*
SEX	
Male	83.59
Female	16.42
RACE	
Black	85.82
White	12.69
Other	1.50

[2]WALD, Patricia, "Poverty and Criminal Justice," in Task Force Report: The Courts, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

[3]The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967, p 44.

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE OF PROJECT CROSSROADS ADULT PARTICIPANTS ENROLLED BETWEEN SEPTEMBER, 1968 AND NOVEMBER, 1969

MARITAL STATUS	
Single	82.09
Married	16.42
Other	1.50
BIRTHPLACE	
D.C.	62.41
Other U.S.	30.08
Other	7.53
AGE	
18-19	60.45
20-21	23.13
22-23	9.70
24+	5.97
Other	.75
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS	
1 parent only	55.97
Alone	14.18
Relatives	11.20
2 parents	8.21
Other	10.44
SOURCE OF SUPPORT	
Parent	47.76
Self	38.06
Other	14.18
HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED	
9th or lower	15.59
10th	20.90
11th	26.12
12th (high school)	22.39
13th	6.72
Other	8.28
POSITION AT INTAKE	
No employment, non-student	38.81
No employment, student	17.17
Employed, non-student	38.82
Employed, student	8.21
PREVIOUS MILITARY--MALE	
No	87.50
Yes	12.50

*Total Sample is 134 Adult Participants.

To sum, the background of project participants is similar to that already characterized by sociologists, crime prevention commercials on television, and government commissions delving into problems of crime in the cities. The Crossroads participant is young, male, and black. He is living in a broken home. His main source of support is someone other than himself. He is a high school dropout. It is an assumption of the project that lack of skills, high school diploma, and unstable employment history makes him a likely recidivist--unless an intervening variable (such as a pre-trial diversion project) can alter or divert an already patterned course.

The Employment Variable

Project Crossroads was designed to serve "a person young enough to be amenable to intensive, short-term manpower services" and whose future would be enhanced by a diversion from routine court processes. The major supportive service offered a participant was employment and/or job training. Previous studies have pointed to the lack of job skills and the irregularity of employment as being related to criminal careers.

To employ individuals, and hopefully reduce recidivism, the employment division of the project worked with potential employers to develop jobs and uncover available openings, as well as with Crossroads participants for job/training referrals and placements. Approximately 50% of the Crossroads participants were placed in one or more jobs during their three-month enrollment. Participants received anywhere up to nine job referrals, although most were placed within the first, second, or third referral. Although 28 of the sample were placed in job training centers, only nine individuals completed a training program. The researcher's task was to assess the effectiveness of the project in terms of a participant's employment on a short- and long-term basis.

Project participants were relatively underemployed, unskilled and working for low wages, if working at all, when enrolled. Efforts of the employment division were aimed at "enhancing the productivity and employability of disadvantaged workers and directly aiding their job placement."[4] Thus, indicants of project success can be seen as decreases in unemployment over time, coupled with increases in wage and skill level. Short-term and long-range employment success will be reviewed in light of the goals of the project.

Employment at Project Termination

The employment service at Crossroads functioned to place an individual in a job with potential for mobility. Unfortunately, the reality of job openings and the skill level of the participants kept this goal in the realm of theory for many. Still, a short-term employment "impact" is noticeable when we compare relevant variables at intake and at termination from the project. Tables 2, 3, and 4 can be viewed as a summary statement of the short-range impace of employment services provided during Crossroads, and offer a comparison with a participant's pre-project status.

Table 2 reveals that at time of intake, approximately 56% of the participants were unemployed. Of these, almost two-fifths were both unemployed and out of school. In contrast, upon project termination, unemployment decreased to approximately 30%--which includes an unknown proportion who were enrolled in school. Perhaps the most significant comparison is that between favorably terminated participants and their project intake statistics. Here we find the employment percentage at termination (87%) to be twice as large as employment at intake (44%). Participants who receive a favorable termination from Project Crossroads are those who have been successful in obtaining and holding employment while enrolled. Although there may be a history of one, two or three job referrals before a successful placement, almost 90% of the Favorables are employed as they leave Crossroads. In contrast, only 10% of the Unfavorables were employed on termination.

[4]Set as a goal for the entire Manpower Division of the Department of Labor. Manpower Report of the President, U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1970.

TABLE 2. COMPARISON BETWEEN EMPLOYMENT AT INTAKE AND UPON TERMINATION FROM PROJECT CROSSROADS FOR ADULT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	TIME OF INTAKE		TIME OF TERMINATION					
			TOTAL**		Favorable**		Unfavorable	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
YES*	59	44.03	88	70.40	85	87.64	3	10.72
Student	11	8.21						
Non-student	48	35.82						
NO	75	55.98	37	29.60	12	12.38	25	89.29
Student	23	17.17						
Non-student	52	38.81	125		97		28	

*Includes Both Full-time and Part-time Employment.

**Significant at the .01 Level (chi-square)

Wages also increased between intake and termination. Table 3 reveals increases, particularly in the $2.75 per hour and over category. Since the greatest increase is in the upper wage categories, wage increases cannot be attributable solely to increases in the minimum wage. For some participants, increases reflect increasing skill on the job and length of employment. This is particularly true for those individuals who were employed at intake and who did not find jobs through Crossroads. There is the strong probability that the project's assistance in having the charges against a participant nol-prossed, as well as providing less tangible supportive services, was a major factor in their employment success. For a number of Crossroads participants, steady employment was maintained for the first time, and, at a higher wage than in previous positions. It is interesting that for those participants who were employed during Crossroads, wages were not dramatically different for favorable and unfavorable terminations; wages after termination, in contrast, differ markedly between the two groups.

TABLE 3. COMPARISON BETWEEN WAGE AT INTAKE AND AT TERMINATION FROM PROJECT CROSSROADS FOR ADULT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE

AVERAGE PER HOUR WAGE*	TIME OF INTAKE		TIME OF TERMINATION					
			TOTAL**		Favorable**		Unfavorable	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
$1.26-1.75	67	55.37	47	45.63	40	44.44	7	53.85
$1.76-2.25	44	36.36	36	34.95	32	35.55	4	30.77
$2.26-2.75	9	8.26	11	10.68	10	11.11	1	7.69
$2.76+	1	.83	9	8.74	8	8.89	1	7.69

*Average Per Hour Wage is Estimated by the Use of Relative Weights Given for the Proportion of Time Worked in Particular Jobs During the Year Preceding Crossroads Intake and During Participation Period.

This goes along with our findings in Table 4: the skill level of employment for favorably and unfavorably terminated participants was relatively similar in all skill categories. While there was some improvement in skill level from intake, the project appears to have affected wages more than it did skills. No doubt, in certain cases, increased wages were concurrent with increased skills. Yet, it is more likely that the employment service avoided placing participants in the lower paying positions and made referrals to the higher paying jobs, without effective true skill change.

TABLE 4. COMPARISON BETWEEN SKILL LEVEL AT INTAKE AND AT TERMINATION FROM PROJECT CROSSROADS FOR ADULT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE

SKILL LEVEL	TIME OF INTAKE		TIME OF TERMINATION					
			TOTAL**		Favorable**		Unfavorable	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Unskilled	37	61.66	57	50.00	47	48.96	10	55.55
Semi-skilled	19	31.66	40	35.09	34	35.42	6	33.33
Skilled	4	6.66	9	7.89	8	8.44	1	5.55
Clerical-office	*	--	8	7.02	7	7.29	1	5.55

*Not Recorded.

We have not included any figures on percent of time employed during Crossroads, since this figure doesn't account for time spent in repeated referral interviews until "proper" placement was found. What the short-range employment statistics have shown is that participants terminating the project are more likely to be employed, in a higher skilled position and for higher wages, than they were upon entering the project. Because employment is by definition related to the final participant evaluation of favorable or unfavorable, perhaps a more meaningful indicant of project employment success is over the "long-range" period of one year following project termination.

Employment After Termination

Follow-up employment information was gathered on 134 participants.[5] Each participant had been away from the project for at least six months. Calculations based upon a full year's earnings and employment were estimated by weighted averages extended over a 12-month period.[6] It was the unanimous agreement of the Crossroads staff that employment information given by former participants in follow-up interviews would be valid. But a possible bias introduced through the follow-up interviews was that individuals who were reached for follow-up may represent the more stable population. Still, this does not undercut the fact that Project Crossroads might have been in some way responsible and supportive.

Participants were asked many questions regarding employment during follow-up interviews. Table 5 is quite revealing, comparing steady employment prior to and after termination from Crossroads. One year after project termination, over half of all the

[5]All results are based on the follow-up sample. It was found via cross-tabulations, that this group did not differ markedly from the larger sample on any relevant group characteristics.

[6]A more detailed explanation is found in the cost-benefit study of Project Crossroads.

participant sample had been employed for at least 80% of the year. This should be compared to the only one-third having been employed 80% of the year prior to project entrance. This gain in steady employment after project termination is really a gain for those favorably terminated; Unfavorables remain relatively unemployed.[7]

TABLE 5. COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF YEAR EMPLOYED PREVIOUS TO PROJECT CROSSROADS ENTRANCE AND PERCENTAGE OF YEAR EMPLOYED ONE YEAR FOLLOWING TERMINATION

PERCENT OF YEAR EMPLOYED*	ONE YEAR PRIOR TO PROJECT CROSSROADS		ONE YEAR AFTER TERMINATION					
	Time of Intake		Total**		Favorable**		Unfavorable	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
0- 19	31	23.14	41	30.61	24	23.09	17	56.68
20- 39	29	21.65	9	6.73	6	5.78	3	10.00
40- 59	19	14.19	5	3.74	3	2.90	2	6.68
60- 79	14	10.46	10	7.47	9	8.66	1	3.34
80- 89	6	4.48	12	8.96	10	9.62	2	6.68
90-100	35	26.12	57	42.54	52	50.00	5	16.67
TOTAL	134		134		104		30	

*Full- and Part-time.

**Significant at .01 level (chi-square).

To some extent, increased age is related to increases in percent of time employed: the older the participant, the more likely he is to be working for a greater percent of time both prior to and after termination from Crossroads. When we hold age constant, we find that 17% of the 18-year olds are employed over 80% of the year prior to Crossroads, while 39% of this group is employed over 80% of the year after Crossroads. And, when we account for increased age by comparing 20 year old "priors" with 19-year old "afters," we still find an increase in employment in the "after" group (17 percentage point difference). This appears to rule out increased age as a determining variable. Finally, while increases in educational attainment would be ordinarily expected to have an effect on employment status over a 12-month period, this is not a factor in the present analysis since only youths engaged in full-time employment are compared in the pre- and post-project periods. In short, increase in time employed over a period of one year following project termination appears related to services provided by Crossroads.

When we compare favorable and unfavorable terminations, the effects of the project are even more apparent: approximately 60% of those favorably terminated were employed for more than four-fifths of the year following termination, while only 23% of those unfavorably terminated were employed for the same period. Since recidivism and sentencing would not automatically lower an individual's percentage of time employed (the formula is based on time available for employment), we cannot attribute the difference to an individual's unavailability for employment.

[7]Since our early figures are estimates, having been arrested and/or sentenced does not spuriously deflate statistics. Estimates are based upon time available for work.

In short, we feel comfortable in our finding that enrollment in Project Crossroads and termination with a favorable recommendation is related to a substantial increase in steady employment over the year following Crossroads termination.

A check on the chronology of post-project employment reveals that for those favorably terminated participants who held jobs upon Crossroads termination, almost all were working in a non-Crossroads job within four months after Crossroads termination. Thus, we are led to believe that the routine of work, as well as such intangibles as self-confidence and increased aspiration derived from the Crossroads experience, tend to keep an individual employed after the official relationship with Crossroads is ended.

Wage increases parallel our employment findings. Although the estimated average wage per hour one year following termination is much higher than for one year prior to entrance, the increase falls to our favorably terminated group (Table 6). While only 6% of those employed prior to intake received over $2.26 per hour, approximately 33% of the favorable terminations were receiving this wage. No doubt, time spent on the job and inflation all have their part to play in increased earnings. The cost-benefit study will have more to say on this matter and will not be discussed here. Still, our comparison between favorably and unfavorably terminated participants leads us to believe that if natural changes (such as inflation and increased age) were important variables in this matter, they would have affected the unfavorably terminated group to a larger degree. If increased time employed contributes to higher wages, then Crossroads is to some measure responsible. In short, individuals who are considered "successes" in Project Crossroads, and terminate with a favorable recommendation, are more likely to be receiving higher wages for their work than are project "non-successes."

TABLE 6. COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED AVERAGE WAGE PER HOUR RECEIVED AT INTAKE AND ONE YEAR FOLLOWING PROJECT CROSSROADS PARTICIPATION

AVERAGE WAGE	WAGE AT INTAKE		WAGE ONE YEAR FOLLOWING PROJECT					
			Total**		Favorable**		Unfavorable	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
0-$1.00*	13	9.70	39	29.11	23	22.12	16	53.34
$1.01- 1.25	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
$1.26- 1.50	20	14.93	2	1.50	2	1.93	--	--
$1.51- 1.75	47	35.08	15	11.20	11	10.58	4	13.34
$1.76- 2.00	27	20.15	19	14.18	15	14.43	4	13.34
$2.01- 2.25	17	12.69	22	16.42	18	17.31	4	13.34
$2.25- 2.50	8	5.97	15	11.20	13	12.50	2	6.67
$2.51- 2.75	1	.75	6	4.48	6	5.77	--	--
$2.76- 3.00	1	.75	9	6.72	9	8.66	--	--
$3.01+	--	--	7	5.32	7	6.75	--	--
TOTAL	134		134		104		30	

*Comprised Mainly of the Unemployed.
**Significant at the .01 level (chi-square).

SUMMARY

The quantitative data on the employment of adult participants followed for a year after project termination reveals:

1. The percent of individuals employed at project termination is nearly twice as great as those employed at project intake.

2. Upon termination from Project Crossroads, wages and skill level of job performed had increased over measures taken at project entrance.

3. Project participants are more likely to be steadily employed during the year following project termination than prior to enrollment.

4. Wage comparisons reveal that increases occur after Crossroads termination--and these increases appear related more to job factors than non-job-related ones.

5. All positive findings are attributable to the group of favorably terminated participants.

These findings tell what one can expect from project participants in the employment sphere after termination. What it also highlights is the small group of unfavorably terminated individuals--those project "failures"--who will most likely continue to "fail" after project termination. The concluding chapter of this paper hopes to speak to the problems of this group.

IV. PROJECT IMPACT ON RECIDIVISM

A defendant before the criminal court is a "loser" in many ways. Perhaps his mere presence in the courtroom, a testimony to the fact that, guilty or not, he has not succeeded in avoiding the differential selectivity of police arrests, labels him a loser at the outset. If he is found innocent of the charges pending, or no action is pressed by the prosecutor, he retains a permanent arrest record. If he is adjudicated guilty or pleads guilty, he then acquires a conviction record and the imposition of a "rehabilitative" measure. His new label of "criminal" will then function to negatively influence his economic and social future.

We have already documented that Project Crossroads increases employment stability, wages, and skill levels for participants--specifically, for those who terminate with a favorable recommendation. In the present chapter we attempt to explore the impact the project has on variables related to the justice system (case backlog and factors of time, expense, and personnel) and the participant's "legal" future (police record and recidivism). Comparisons with a control sample have been made wherever relevant and possible.

Note on First Offender Adult Status

From a sociological perspective, as well as a rehabilitative one, the notion that the participants enrolled in Project Crossroads are first offenders is misleading. Technically, they have no previous adult conviction record in Washington, D.C. (any previous juvenile record not involving institutionalization for delinquency was disregarded). Realistically, the probability of an extensive juvenile record is high. In short, the "first offender" label is an artifical one, more meaningful for administrative purposes than for rehabilitative ones. Although this researcher is not impractical enough to negate the need for distinctions which keep a system operating, as one criterion for project acceptance it is more related to working with the court than it is to working with the participant. A true first offender at 19, 24, or 30 years of age, is a different person than the "first offender" under 18 years of age with an extensive juvenile delinquency history. In short, project entrance criteria should be rethought in terms of the rehabilitative, as opposed to the court administrative, function.

Disposition of Original Charge for Adult Sample

A number of adjudicatory alternatives are open to the individual charged in adult court: nol-pros (prosecution declined), dismissal for want of prosecution, acquittal, or guilty. The "nol-pros" category is desirable for the participant because it can (1) preclude a possible adjudication of guilty or involvement and consequent sentencing, (2) shorten court time, and (3) avoid the social and economic liability of a criminal record. The court's advantage in working with the project lies with the reductions in hearings and trials when a simple "nol-pros" decision can be made upon a favorable Crossroads recommendation.

When we look at Table 7, it is obvious that participants who terminated Crossroads with a favorable recommendation were nol-prossed three times as often as the control sample (99% versus 33%). Since this form of adjudication was consistent for approximately all of the Favorables, a closer look must be had at the Unfavorables. Here we find a similarity with our control sample. Less than one-third of the Unfavorables' cases are nol-prossed, although a relatively higher number of them than of the controls are subsequently dismissed or acquitted (15%). Although dismissal is a favorable finding for the defendant, court time has still been tied up in case processing. The probation, prison, and fine categories represent dispositions for guilt, which become responsible for approximately 34% (or more, since we have a large "unknown" gap) of those unfavorably terminated and 32% of the control group. Thus, the financial and managerial burden of rehabilitation via these techniques are necessitated for one-third of those controls and unfavorably terminated participants who appear before the court. Table 7 also reveals that imprisonment is infrequently used, while probation is heavily relied upon.

TABLE 7. COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANT UNIVERSE AND CONTROL SAMPLE ON LEGAL ADJUDICATION OF CHARGE

SAMPLES	TOTAL	NOL-PROS		DISMISSAL OR ACQUITTAL		PROBATION		PRISON		FINE		UNKNOWN		NOT APPLICABLE	
	No.	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Participants															
Total	200	162	81.00	9	4.50	10	5.00	4	2.00	4	2.00	10	5.00	1	.50
Favorable	149	148	99.33	1	.67	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Unfavorable	51	14	27.45	8	15.69	10	19.69	4	7.84	4	7.84	10	19.69	1	1.99
Controls	107	36	33.65	22	20.56	26	24.30	7	6.54	2	1.84	14	13.08	--	--

Statistics on dismissals and acquittals obviate the fact that hearings, jury trials and court trials have had to take place before reaching these decisions. More apparent is the burden on the adjudicative mechanism for cases found guilty by plea or trial coupled with the rehabilitative efforts of probation and prison. In other words, a favorable termination from Crossroads appears to significantly alter charge adjudication and subsequent disposition--having its effect on both the participant and the court.

Although the accompanying cost-benefit study measures financial savings for the court and society, the program's impact on participant attitudes was not measured. It is hypothesized that the willingness of the court to explore alternatives and act in good faith with project recommendations does a great deal not only to the court's "image" but the client's attitude toward the legal system.

Adult Recidivism

Perhaps the most dramatic positive finding related to the project's legal "success" criteria is the reduction in recidivism for its favorably terminated participants. According to Table 8, overall recidivism (defined in this study as "rearrest") for the Favorables was 20.13%, while for the Unfavorables and Controls it was over twice as high. When we combine all project participants, we still find a difference of 14% between participants and Controls who recidivate within 15 months after initial arrest.

TABLE 8. COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANT UNIVERSE AND CONTROL SAMPLE RECIDIVISM WITHIN 15 MONTHS OF INITIAL ARREST*

	TOTAL SAMPLE**		RECIDIVISM*	
SAMPLES	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Participants				
Total	200	100.00	59	29.50
Favorable	149	74.50	30	20.13
Unfavorable	51	25.50	29	56.65
Controls	107	100.00	46	43.36

*Data Obtained from Metropolitan Police Records.

**Significant at the .05 level (chi-square).

To this figure must be added a qualification. Although the control sample matched the participant sample on group characteristics, an ex-post facto stratification of the samples for the age variable revealed an important dissimilarity: approximately 60% of the participant sample was between 18 and 19 years old, while only 52% of the control sample fell between these ages. Since our data reveals that 18 and 19 year olds are more likely to recidivate than the older age group, an age adjustment for recidivism resulted in a difference between the participant and control group which is approximately 17%. (The new control recidivism rate being 46.73%.) While other factors in addition to age are related to recidivism, it was felt that as a criteria for enrollment in Crossroads, age was an important variable upon which to stratify the groups.

In short, there is little doubt that recidivism in Washington, D.C., within a 15-month period following initial arrest was markedly lower for participants who were

favorably terminated from the project. While 57% of the unfavorable terminations recidivated, only 20% of the favorable terminations did. Although little can be said for rearrests outside Washington, D.C., there is no reason to assume that such rates would be different for the participant and control samples.

It was interesting to discover that for the control sample, recidivism was almost as high for those on probation (46%) as for those who were imprisoned (57%). When we looked at recidivism-by-disposition for our Unfavorables, we found: 40% of those receiving a nol-pros recidivated, as did 40% of the dismissals, and 50% of those on probation. Although figures are too small to offer definitive conclusions, the effectiveness of probation as it now exists in deterring recidivism must be questioned.

Similarities between Unfavorables and Controls also exist in the distribution of recidivism over time. Forty-one percent of the recidivism among Unfavorables occurs within three months after initial arrest; the proportion for Controls over the same period is 50% (Table 9). Since in many ways the behavior of the unfavorable participant sample is similar to that of the control sample--project enrollment having little apparent effect on behavior--the ability either to "screen-in" candidates with whom the Crossroads approach will be successful or to provide additional and/or intensive project services for those who cannot "make it" in the existing program is critical to future demonstration projects with the recidivism concern. Also, since the tendency to recidivate, at least for Favorables, was held in check during Crossroads supervision, the desirability of sudden, as opposed to gradual, termination from future projects should be evaluated. Implications for program alteration and participant screening will be made in the concluding section of this paper.

TABLE 9. COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANT UNIVERSE AND CONTROL SAMPLE RECIDIVISM DURING AND AFTER THE PROJECT

	TOTAL RECIDIVISM		RECIDIVISM WITHIN PROJECT (0-3 months)		RECIDIVISM AFTER PROJECT (4-15 months)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Participants						
Total	59	29.50	17	28.81	42	71.19
Favorable	30	20.13	5	16.67	25	83.33
Unfavorable	29	56.65	12	41.38	17	58.62
Controls	46	43.36	23	50.00	23	50.00

Although there are interesting questions to be asked about the repetition of certain offenses, it was decided that most of these were tangential to our main concern. The charges for which participants are brought before the court and into the project should be noted in Table 10. In comparison with rearrest charges, we observe a slight rise in rearrest for the more serious offense categories: robbery, burglary, assault, and narcotics. It is interesting to note the relatively large number of disorderly conduct charges upon rearrest. Whether this is a question of minor individual misconduct or police harrassment is difficult to assess.

TABLE 10. ORIGINAL CHARGE AND REARREST CHARGE FOR PARTICIPANT UNIVERSE

CHARGE	ORIGINAL ARREST		REARREST	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Narcotics	2	1.00	3	5.08
Larceny	122	61.00	13	22.03
Assault	4	2.00	4	6.79
Disorderly Conduct	--	--	5	8.47
Auto Offenses	35	17.50	8	13.56
Robbery	--	--	8	13.56
Fraud	5	2.50	2	3.39
Burglary	3	1.50	7	11.86
Weapons Offenses	6	3.00	3	5.08
Prostitution-Procuring	4	2.00	3	5.08
Destroying Property	7	3.50	1	1.69
Homicide	--	--	1	1.69
Stolen Property	10	5.00	--	--
Other Misdemeanors	2	1.00	1	1.69
TOTAL	200	100%	59	100%

Juvenile Recidivism

Although juvenile participants were not followed-up with interviews, recidivism data was obtained from the Research Division of the Juvenile Court. A control sample was taken (explained in Section II) and followed in the court records for recidivism. In the course of checking Juvenile Court records for participants, it was discovered that 57.78% were first offenders at enrollment but 42.22% had had previous delinquency records. Some of the latter youths had been knowingly admitted to the project in the absence of eligible first offenders referred by the court; in many other cases, however, previous histories were unknown at project intake.

In order to obtain a valid comparison, the control sample (all of whom were first offenders) was compared with the true first offender juvenile participants. The result was an absence of any noticeable difference in recidivism: over a 15-month period there was a 26.5% recidivism for first offender participants and 28.8% for Controls. A chronological evaluation, dividing recidivism into three-month intervals, also exhibits no substantial difference between the groups. Thus, it appears that Project Crossroads had no special effect on the recidivism rate of its juvenile participants.

Although there was no decrease in recidivism, it is still possible to learn from the behavior of the total juvenile sample at a particular point in time. Here we find that while 28% of the true first offenders recidivated, 61% of those with a previous record did. In other words, there appears to be a strong tendency to recidivism for individuals with a previous record. For both first offenders and those with an arrest record, about 50% of all recidivism occurs within the three months after arrest. It might be worthwhile for future programs to consider efforts directed at a younger juvenile population, in a less work-oriented context, in order to deter the onset of a delinquency career pattern.

SUMMARY

A pre-trial diversion program not only attempts to channel the accused offender away from court processing and into a program of employment, training, counseling, and remedial education, it also attempts to deter the first offender from recidivating. In assessing the impact of Project Crossroads on legal variables, and comparing the participant group with a control sample, it was found that for adults:

a. Recidivism was substantially decreased for the participant group (when compared with a control sample), the decrease being attributable to the favorably terminated participants.

b. Participants terminated with a favorable recommendation to the courts are in almost every case "nol-prossed." Of those terminated with an unfavorable recommendation, only one-half of the group was "nol-prossed," dismissed, or acquitted.

c. Unfavorably terminated participants mirror the Controls in terms of adjudication of charge, time of rearrest, and percent of recidivism.

d. Recidivism appears to entail a progression to more serious crimes.

When we explored the juvenile statistics, we discovered this:

a. Project participation did not decrease recidivism (as compared with a control group).

b. A previous arrest record is positively related to recidivism within 15 months.

Some implications of these findings will be found in the concluding section.

V. "PREDICTING" SUCCESS IN CROSSROADS

Whenever we attempt to predict behavior--in school, at home, on the job--we are drawing upon one or a set of indicants which has been observed to be related to the behaviors in which we are interested, or which have already proved valid referents. When it is criminal behavior we are trying to predict, the indices can take various forms, depending upon one's perspective and purposes. For example, if we start from the premise that characteristics of individual offenders can be used to predict future criminal behavior, we would look at personal characteristics, life histories, attitudes, and self-conceptions. If we start from the premise that this behavior is part of a life-style of individuals, we would focus on modes of criminal operation, stiuations in which offenses occur, subcultural norms, etc. Thirdly, if we adhere to the assumption that criminality relates to conditions and processes by which behaviors become defined as criminal, we would explore the differential handling of different types of individuals by the police, prosecutors, and the courts.

Although Project Crossroads was designed to focus on offender characteristics, the relevancy of the other approaches cannot be overlooked in the present section. Still, what we are focusing upon are personal variables which appear to bear some relationship to favorable termination from the program, and non-recidivism. The present section treats these variables individually, exploring cumulative effects whenever relevant and feasible.

It has already been shown that Crossroads has reduced recidivism* and increased employment,* wages, and job skill levels over a 15-month period. Yet, a small percentage of participants do not work out favorably in the program and recidivate within the year after initial charge. In order to make the present project more effective in terms of its choice of future participants, the present section explores "success"-related variables.

Indicants of Favorable Project Termination

Of the adult participant sample of 134, 22% were unfavorably terminated. In other words, utilizing the criteria for "successful" termination established by the project, the program did not "reach" one-fifth of the total group. Recidivism during the project, unwillingness to obtain and hold a job, lack of effort to maintain stable family and social relationships, chronic uncooperativeness with counselors, and abscondance were, singly or in combination, grounds for their unfavorable termination from the project and return to the normal adjudication process. On the other hand, 78% of the sample performed satisfactorily in the project, were terminated favorably, and were recommended for favorable court action on their pending charges.

There can be no doubt that individual motivation plays a key role in program success. Although motivation wasn't measured, the project attempted to provide incentives: a nol-prossed charge, a job suited for the individual, and a close relationship with a counselor genuinely concerned with the participant's future. Family situation and other intervening variables were also not quantified. The following discussion will focus on the information derived from quantitative records completed by staff personnel.

Employment Variables

There is little doubt that a participant's work history is related to a favorable termination from the project (Table 11). Those participants employed at intake were far more likely to receive a favorable termination from Crossroads than were the unemployed. As shown in Table 11, approximately 90% of all participants who were employed at intake received a favorable termination from the project. In addition, those participants who

*To a statistically significant degree (.01 level on chi-square).

were relatively steadily employed during the year prior to Crossroads enrollment (i.e., more than 60% of the year), as well as those who had been employed in skilled or semi-skilled positions and those receiving higher wages ($2.25 plus per hour), were more likely to perform successfully in the project. Although self-support appears related to favorable termination, the indeterminate group of student participants who performed successfully cloud this finding.

TABLE 11. EMPLOYMENT AND TYPE OF TERMINATION FROM CROSSROADS FOR ADULT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE

EMPLOYMENT	FAVORABLE TERMINATION*		UNFAVORABLE TERMINATION**	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Source of Support at Intake				
Self	43	84.32	8	15.69
Parents	47	73.44	17	26.57
Spouse	3	100.00	--	--
Other Relatives	3	100.00	--	--
Other ( )	(8)		(5)	
Skill Level at Intake				
Unskilled	31	83.79	6	16.22
Semi-skilled	17	89.48	2	10.53
Skilled	4	100.00	--	--
Not Applicable ( )	(52)		(22)	
Average Wage Per Hour at Intake				
$1.26-$1.50	12	60.00	8	40.00
$1.51- 1.75	39	82.98	8	17.03
$1.76- 2.00	21	77.78	6	22.23
$2.01- 2.25	13	76.47	4	23.53
$2.26- 2.50	8	100.00	--	--
$2.51+	2	100.00	--	--
Other ( )	(9)		(4)	
Percentage of Prior Year Employed at Intake				
0-19	21	67.74	10	35.26
20-39	21	72.41	8	27.59
40-59	14	73.68	5	26.32
60-79	12	85.71	2	14.29
80-99	36	87.80	5	12.20
Employed at Intake				
Yes - Non-student	43	89.59	5	10.42
Yes - Student	10	90.91	1	9.09
No - Non-student	32	61.54	20	38.47
No - Student	19	82.61	4	17.40

*N = 104.
**N = 30.

When we consider those participants most likely to be unfavorably terminated, we find that unemployment at intake (as well as being out of school) is an important determinant. We also find reliance on parental support and earning a relatively low wage ($1.25-$1.50 per hour) when working (most likely in an unskilled job) to be related to doing poorly in the project.

Personal Variables

To some extent, work stability may be a function of age. When we observe the relationship between age and favorable termination (Table 12), we find a trend towards a higher project success rate with older participants. It is likely that age and employment history are related to some degree and that the most favorable combination for success in Crossroads is older age and a background of steady employment.

Although Table 12 shows that 82.36% (14) of the white participants received favorable recommendations on termination, while only 76.53% (88) of the black participants did, the small number of whites in the sample and the small difference between the groups in percentage points make definitive statements difficult. When we look at the personal characteristics which differentiate between the racial groups it becomes evident that the more favorable termination ratio for whites is attributable to a cluster of background characteristics which distinguish these groups (e.g., age, education, employment), and which are independently highly correlated with project success. For example, we find that whites comprise the older group of participants (41% are over 21 years of age, compared with 24% of the blacks); they are more likely to have received a high school diploma and/or further education (59% versus 29%); have had a history of relatively steady employment (41% of the whites were employed for 70% of the year or more, in contrast to 36% of the blacks).

It is uncertain whether sex differences are related to success in Project Crossroads: 79% of the male sample and 68% of the female participant sample were favorably terminated. When we look closely at what it means to be female, we find: females comprise the younger participant group (64% were between 18 and 19 years old, compared with 59% of the males); they are more likely to be supported, either by welfare and unemployment compensation (14% versus 00% for males) or by a spouse (13% versus 00% for males); are neither employed nor enrolled in school at intake (68% versus 33% of males): have a poor employment history (9% of the females were employed for at least four-fifths of the year prior to intake, contrasting with 35% of the males); and have a poor school history (23% completed high school versus 34% of the males). In short, "femaleness," similar to race, has meaning when understood in relation to its many sex-linked variables which are pertinent to project performance.

Marital status is slightly related to project success: 86% of those married were favorably terminated, versus 75% of the single group. Yet, we find that those who are married are more often female and that age bears no relationship to marital status. These findings are particularly interesting in view of our previous findings that (1) females are more likely than males to become unfavorable terminations; and (2) age plays an important role in project success. The discovery that the marital state reverses the sex relationship and neutralizes the age factor suggests that there is something peculiar to the marital state, be it personal maturity, sense of responsibility, social attachment, or whatever, which exerts a strong positive influence on project performance.

Although mentioned in conjunction with the racial and sexual variables, the importance of the school variable should be re-emphasized. Graduation from high school is related to project success; all participants enrolled in higher education (9) were favorably terminated.

TABLE 12. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND TYPE OF TERMINATION FROM CROSSROADS FOR ADULT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	FAVORABLE TERMINATION*		UNFAVORABLE TERMINATION**	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Age				
18	34	72.34	13	28.27
19	27	77.15	8	22.86
20	12	75.00	4	25.00
21	13	86.67	2	13.34
22	6	75.00	2	25.00
23	5	100.00	--	--
24+	7	87.50	1	12.50
Sex				
Male	89	79.47	23	20.54
Female	15	68.19	7	31.82
Race				
Black	88	76.53	27	23.48
White	14	82.36	3	17.65
Other ( )	(2)			
Marital Status				
Single	83	75.46	27	24.55
Married	19	86.37	3	13.64
Other ( )	(2)			

*N = 104.

**N = 30.

To conclude, it is suggested that racial and sexual variables are related to success in Project Crossroads only to the extent to which they are related to employment and school variables. The marital variable appears relevant, although an explanation as to why it is so is speculative. While program implications will be discussed in a later section, we should note that the participant characteristics just presented tell us almost as much about the success of the local school system, as well as other social agencies professing to be children- and youth-oriented.

Indicants of Recidivism

We have seen that recidivism occurs both during and after project termination, with those unfavorably terminated likely to have recidivated during the project. Although it is important to know those types of individuals who work well within the project, it is equally important to discover those characteristics related to recidivism. Here we are

interested in looking at recidivism for the total participant sample and recidivism, after project termination, for the favorably terminated group.

Table 13 reveals some general characteristics of recidivists. One of the most striking differentials shown in the table is that 38.40% of all males in the sample recidivated within a 15-month period after project entrance, while only 18.19% of the females recidivated. This finding that male participants were far more rearrest-prone than female participants is consistent with FBI statistics on the sex ratio of arrested offenders.[8] Here it is important to keep in mind that an unknown but undoubtedly substantial proportion of differences in the sex distribution of offenders is the result of certain peculiarities of the criminal justice cycle. For example, female crimes are generally less visible than male crimes (e.g., prostitution, shoplifting). In addition, the "victim" in a crime by a female is very often an individual not considering himself one and consequently not filing a complaint with the police. There is also the possibility that statistics on the sex ratio of offenders reflect differences in police handling of illegal situations. The point being made is that just as "maleness" is related to offense type, it is also related to police enforcement procedures. These factors become all the more important when we note that females are more likely to have dropped out of high school than are males, twice as likely to be both unemployed and out of school at time of intake, and more likely to have been employed for less of the year prior to intake.

The age factor, as related to recidivism, coincides with the findings of other studies: chronological age is a predictor of future criminality; the earlier an individual is arrested, the more likely he is to recidivate.[9] According to our findings, 18- and 19-year old participants have a higher rate of rearrest than older youths. Unfortunately, it is difficult to know whether this younger group has had more contact with the courts as delinquent offenders or if the group is "true" first offenders, which would bear upon early criminal career patterns.

The racial factor tells us that 37.40% of the black participants as opposed to 23.53% of the white participants recidivated within 15 months. Already mentioned was the fact that blacks in the sample are likely to be the youngest members in addition to having the least amount of education and regular employment, characteristics which are correlated with recidivism as well as unfavorable project performance. Although no definite proof can be offered, the possibility of differential arrests made on the basis of race may also account for some portion of the difference.[10]

[8]FBI Uniform Crime Statistics, Washington, D.C.

[9]CLINARD, Marshall and QUINNEY, Richard: Criminal Behavior Systems, New York; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

[10]GOLDMAN, Nathan: The Differential Selection of Juvenile Offenders for Court Appearance, National Research and Information Center, National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

TABLE 13. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RECIDIVISTS IN ADULT PARTICIPATION

CHARACTERISTICS	NUMBER	PERCENT
Sex		
Male (112)	43	38.40%
Female (22)	4	18.19
Age		
18 years (46)	18	39.13
19 years (35)	14	40.00
20 years (16)	5	31.25
21 years (15)	5	33.34
22 years (8)	2	25.00
23 years (5)	--	--
24+ (8)	3	37.50
Race		
Black (115)	43	37.40
White (17)	4	23.53
Marital Status		
Single (110)	42	38.19
Married (22)	4	18.19
Other (2)	1	--
Living Arrangements		
Mother (35)	12	34.29
Father (40)	19	47.50
Wife (5)	1	20.00
Relatives (15)	1	6.67
Alone (19)	7	36.85
Two Parents (11)	5	45.55
Other (9)	2	--
Place of Birth		
D.C. (83)	36	43.38*
South (36)	9	25.00
West (4)	1	25.00
Other (10)	1	--
Military Training		
Yes (14)	4	28.58
No (120)	43	35.85

*Significant at the .05 level (chi-square).

Finally, married participants are only half as likely to recidivate as unmarried youths. This is consistent with the finding that individuals living with a spouse are unlikely to recidivate.

It is curious that individuals living alone with a mother in the house are less likely to recidivate than those living with a father. Although statistics are not offered, there is the likelihood that this is a spurious relationship, accountable, in reality, to variables of employment, school enrollment, etc.

Place of birth provides material upon which to re-evaluate the notion that migrants to urban areas--due to disrupted family ties and living arrangements--account for crime in the city. While this might have been true 20 years ago, changing societal conditions have most probably altered this situation. According to our sample of first offenders, almost twice as many individuals recidivate who have been born in Washington, D.C., as compared with those born elsewhere. From the table we note that individuals born in D.C. are responsible for 78% of the recidivism.

While military training appears slightly related to recidivism (36% of those not having received military training recidivating, compared to 29% who had received military training), it is likely the relationship is explained by the age relationship to military service: the older the participant, the more likely he is to have been in the military.

School and Work Variables

Both attending school and/or being employed are related to non-recidivism. Of the participants who, at time of intake, were neither working nor enrolled in school, 40.39% recidivated within 15 months (Table 14). This compares with the recidivism rate of 26.09% for full-time students and with the non-student worker rate of 33.34%. Whether this finding is due to stability, maturity, or to merely being occupied for some part of the day would be interesting to explore, but not relevant for our purposes.

In addition to not being enrolled in school at intake, the lower an individual's educational attainment, the more probable his recidivism. According to Table 14, high school graudates and those enrolled in college have a substantially lower recidivism rate (11.11% and 23.34%, respectively) than non-high school graduates (42%). Thus, if being a high school dropout is construed as non-success in the school system, this early lack of success appears related to future non-success (in employment, legal spheres, etc). Type of curriculum in school makes no difference in future recidivism.

The more steadily a participant has worked prior to intake, the less likely he is to recidivate. This finding holds consistently. When we dismiss the 0-19% column in Table 14 (the student population), the finding consistently holds for non-steady employment (40-60% of the year) and continues through to steady employment (80-99%). To this we add a relationship between recidivism and unskilled employment, finding that 43% of the unskilled group recidivated as compared with 32% of the semi-skilled.

TABLE 14. SCHOOL AND WORK CHARACTERISTICS OF RECIDIVISTS IN ADULT PARTICIPANT SAMPLE

CHARACTERISTICS	NUMBER	PERCENT
Employed at Intake		
Yes		
Non-student (48)	16	33.34
Student (11)	4	36.37
No		
Non-student (52)	21	40.39
Student (23)	6	26.09
Source of Support		
Parents (64)	25	39.07
Self (51)	16	31.38
Spouse (3)	--	--
Welfare or compensation (3)	--	--
Relatives (3)	1	33.34
No information (10)	5	--
Skill Level at Intake		
Unskilled (37)	16	43.25
Semi-skilled (19)	6	31.58
Skilled (4)	--	--
Not applicable (74)	25	--
Enrolled in School at Intake		
No (99)	37	37.38
Yes		
Full-time (28)	8	28.58
Part-time (6)	2	33.34
Other (1)	--	--
Highest Grade Completed		
9th (18)	8	44.45
10th (28)	12	42.86
11th (35)	16	45.72
High school graduate (34)	8	23.53
13th+ (9)	1	11.11
Other (10)	2	--
Percent of Year Employed Prior to Intake		
0-19 (31)	9	29.00
20-39 (29)	9	31.03
40-59 (19)	11	57.90
60-79 (14)	6	42.86
80-99 (41)	12	29.49

Note on Charge

In attempting to answer the question of whether charge is related to recidivism, caution must be exercised. When individuals are considered "burglars" or "robbers" because they have been arrested for a particular charge, a false impression of specialization is created. It implies that criminals confine themselves to the kinds of crimes for which they happen to be caught. This may or may not be true. While the "personal crime" and

"property crime" categories may more than likely not be committed by the same individuals, patterns across criminal behaviors arise when we look intra-categorically (e.g., a "larceny-burglary" type[11]). We also find the situation where more serious crimes have been "broken down" into lesser components, which can totally alter a charge (e.g., burglary to larceny). Thus, we do not feel it necessary to explore charge statistics for present purposes.

Recidivism of the Favorably Terminated

The above findings indicate that Project Crossroads has had greater relative success with participants with specific personal and background characteristics. Knowing this, it becomes possible to utilize these indicants of project performance at an early stage in project participation in order to give special attention to individual needs, or to shape a program to be oriented towards a particular population.

While some of these findings differentiate between recidivism and non-recidivism in general, the researcher thought it necessary to isolate and observe that group of individuals which could be termed "favorable-recidivists." Although numbers are small (22 in total), it was considered worthwhile to focus on those favorably terminated participants who recidivated within 12 months after project termination, in order to see if an individual's functioning within the project could offer advance indicants of later failure. Characteristics for this group and for the group receiving a favorable termination but who did not recidivate are presented in Tables 15 and 16.

The general characteristics associated with post-project recidivism mirror recidivists in general. While age (youth), race (black), and marital status (single) are variables which appear important, we have already shown that they have meaning only as they cluster with other related variables. Although the quantitative data collected in this report emphasizes employment and school-related variables, differences in socio-economic status, family environment, and area of residence between age and racial groups may account for some part of the findings. Employment information gathered during Crossroads participation is unclear regarding post-project recidivism. While there is a slight tendency to be working at a lower skill and wage level, the strongest indicant of success after Crossroads seems to be the completion of a job training program. In order to assess the effectiveness of job training, per se, we looked more closely at the group of 7 receiving training who did not recidivate. It was startling to discover that 6 were neither employed nor enrolled in school upon intake, none had received a high school diploma or equivalency degree, and that the group was predominantly male, black, single, and 20 years of age or younger. Since the combination of these characteristics usually indicate a potential for project and post-project failure, it appears that a successful completion of a job training program is one way of securing post-project success. The problem then becomes one of making such training available to large numbers and motivating the participant to start and complete such training.

[11] ROEBUCK, Julien: Criminal Typology, Springfield, Illinois; Charles C. Thomas, 1967.

TABLE 15. RECIDIVISTS AFTER FAVORABLE CROSSROADS TERMINATION COMPARED WITH NON-RECIDIVATING FAVORABLY TERMINATED ADULT PARTICIPANTS ON EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS*

CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENT OF "FAVORABLE" RECIDIVISTS*		PERCENT OF NON-RECIDIVATING FAVORABLE GROUP**	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Number of Job Referrals During Crossroads				
1	8	40.00	19	38.77
2	3	15.00	11	22.45
3	2	10.00	8	16.33
4	3	15.00	2	4.08
5+	4	20.00	9	18.37
Not Applicable ( )	(2)		(28)	
Percent of Time Employed During Crossroads				
0-19	3	13.64	8	10.39
20-39	3	13.64	5	6.49
40-59	1	4.54	6	7.79
60-79	3	13.64	13	16.88
80-99	12	54.54	45	58.44
Average Wage Per Hour During Crossroads				
$1.50- 2.00	15	75.00	44	65.67
$2.01- 2.50	4	20.00	11	16.41
$2.51- 3.00	0	--	6	8.96
$3.00+	1	5.00	6	8.96
Not Applicable ( )	(2)		(10)	
Skill Level of Crossroads Positions				
Unskilled	14	63.64	31	56.51
Semi-skilled	7	31.82	24	36.23
Skilled	1	4.54	7	10.14
Clerical	0	--	7	10.14
Other or Non-Applicable	0	--	(8)	--
Training Program During Crossroads				
Placements - No Completions	7	87.50	5	41.67
Placements - One Completion	1	12.50	7	58.33
Not Applicable ( )	(14)	--	(65)	--

*Twenty-two in the group.

**Seventy-seven in the group.

TABLE 16. RECIDIVISM AFTER FAVORABLE CROSSROADS TERMINATION COMPARED WITH NON-RECIDIVATING FAVORABLY TERMINATED ADULT PARTICIPANTS ON GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENT OF "FAVORABLE" RECIDIVISTS*		PERCENT OF NON-RECIDIVATING FAVORABLES*	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Sex				
Male	22	100.00***	62	80.52
Female	0	000	15	19.48
Age				
18-19	16	63.63	42	54.57
20-21	4	18.18	20	25.96
22-23	1	4.54	10	12.98
24+	1	4.54	5	6.49
Race				
White	00	--	12	15.58
Black	22	100.00	65	84.42
Marital Status				
Single	21	95.46	61	79.22
Married	1	4.54	16	20.78
Place of Birth				
D.C.	17	68.17	43	61.42
South	4	18.18	24	34.29
West	1	4.54	3	4.29
Not Applicable ( )			(7)	
Living Arrangements				
Mother only	11	50.00	18	23.37
Father only	1	4.54	1	1.29
Wife/Husband	0	--	13	16.88
Alone	0	--	5	6.49
Two parents	8	36.36	27	35.06
Relatives	2	9.09	10	12.98
Friends	0	--	3	3.93

*Twenty-two in group.

**Seventy-seven in group.

***Significant at the .05 level (chi-square).

SUMMARY

The present section has explored those characteristics which appear to bear some relationship to "success" through Project Crossroads, either in terms of a favorable termination or non-recidivism. We conclude that a number of personal and background characteristics can be used to indicate project and future behavior. These must be taken into consideration in the planning of all future projects of the Crossroads type.

Those individuals who are most likely to be favorably terminated from the project include participants who are male, married, and in their twenties. Those individuals who are most likely to be unfavorably terminated have a work history of unsteady employment, poor work skills and low wages prior to project intake, and an educational history of failure (non-high school graduate).

Indicants of recidivism in most ways parallel the above. The group most likely to recidivate, whether favorably or unfavorably terminated, includes males, youths, the unemployed and non-school enrolled, blacks, singles, the unsteadily and unskilled employed. Those individuals who successfully terminate Project Crossroads but then recidivate are not readily distinguished from those non-recidivating Favorables, although skill level and wage per hour during Crossroads employment somewhat distinguishes these groups. On-the-job training appears strongly related to non-recidivism when the training program is completed.

VI. IMPLICATIONS OF PROJECT FINDINGS

The previous sections of this paper have described the research component and presented an assessment of the quantitative material gathered. The present section will go beyond this, attempting to order and organize project findings according to patterns which emerge from the data, and offering recommendations based upon these findings--including a certain amount of inference and speculation.

The Research Component

Demonstration and/or Experimentation

All projects cannot be expected to do all things with equivalent ease. An experimental and demonstration project which is also required to undertake a research evaluation has many, sometimes conflicting, goals. In an E & D program, the feasibility of new approaches and techniques are tested in practice and insights are achieved through experimentation and change. A research undertaking, on the other hand, oriented towards the gathering, classifying and evaluating of data in order to determine the statistical significance of quantitative differences among program elements, requires a design and methodology not always readily adaptable to experimental projects. While the two approaches are not necessarily incompatible, they place schizophrenic demands on projects attempting to do both. Thought should be given to this problem in advance of program implementation to minimize the inevitable compromises entailed in combining both approaches.

If a systematic, controlled, empirical assessment of a project's impact and effectiveness is desired, the research component should be an integral part of the project, from planning to conclusion. The early inclusion of a researcher would enable him to work "with" rather than "around" the staff, building into the project adequate provision for recording, gathering and evaluating materials. For example, once a concept has been demonstrated feasible to implement, program variations might be included to help identify critical program components. On a larger scale, an initial E & D project could provide the basis for additional projects aimed at inter- and/or intra-program variation in an attempt to delineate the effectiveness of specific techniques.

This, of course, leads us to the question of how to undertake the guidance of many projects working with similar concepts in similar contexts, so as to maximize the systematic gain in knowledge. Although we will not attempt to answer this question in this paper, it is suggested that more thought be given, on the large scale and over the long-run, to ways of identifying reliable techniques and providing valid generalizations. A systematic approach to building upon insights, recommendations and generalizations must be attempted which would in turn influence projects of similar orientation.

The inclusion of the researcher who is viewed as an ex-officio staff member is encouraged. Contracting for the services of this person (as opposed to placing him on salary) would enable him to maintain some "distance" from identification with the project. This was done, successfully, in the case of Project Crossroads.

The researcher might work with the project three times weekly for the first six to eight months of program planning and operations, reducing contact to once weekly after the program has stabilized. The development of the overall research design, as well as data gathering techniques and devices, would be one job of the researcher, in joint venture with the staff. Project supervisors would be held ultimately responsible for case and file review and for the collection of monthly summary statistics.

Staff Orientation

Once goals have been decided upon by the funding agency and the project director, the needs of the program in the area of staff selection become clear. If the research

component is considered an important part of the project, an early staff orientation to the rationale behind data gathering and the relevancy of a research evaluation will gain staff cooperation throughout the project. In the present project, the late inclusion of the research component and its underemphasis during project establishment, made detailed record-keeping a chore for the people-oriented "new careers" staff.

There is little doubt that "new careers" staffs working in programs for the disadvantaged have been of outstanding value.[12] However, this type of staff is unfamiliar with research methods and rationale, initially uninterested in data gathering, and reluctant to combine a people-to-people approach with a certain amount of "paper shuffling."

It is the researcher's opinion that the value of the "new careers" individual far outweighs any misgivings about their acceptance of research as a valid undertaking. For the most part, the initial role orientation of the staff toward the research task--as part of their understanding of the program's goals--will determine later cooperation with the researcher. Lack of skills on the part of this staff is not deemed important or necessarily valid. Thus, we again stress the early inclusion of the researcher into project planning.

Sample Selection

The sampling technique employed in projects of this type should ensure that a sample representative of the larger population be drawn and that each member of the population be given an equal chance of being selected. Although the systematic selection of project participants for the experimental sample in Project Crossroads was acceptable, the simple random is preferable. The ex-post facto selection of the experimental sample served to avoid any inequality of services given to the "chosen" few, since the sample was unknown in advance.

It is suggested that the control sample, on the other hand, be randomly selected from among all individuals meeting project criteria at the same time that the participant population is selected. In other words, a specified number of individuals would be excluded from project entrance based on a randomization process of selection. This would assure participant-control group comparability, and increase the likelihood of reaching the control sample for follow-up purposes. Also, this technique would provide for a base-rate of job finding, job holding, recidivism, and other variables which would be independent of changing external conditions (e.g., alterations in labor conditions). The major difficulty to overcome in control sample selection by this method is the frustration of the staff in turning away "acceptable" individuals.

Follow-Up Information

The follow-up task is important in determining long-range program impact. It is suggested that this information be systematically collected at pre-determined intervals, each counselor being responsible for his own participants as well as for a given group of controls. Data could conceivably be collected for some participants for a two year post-project period (in a three year project).

In addition, the follow-up task might be reconceptualized as being an integral part of the program in addition to being a technique for data gathering. Viewed as a data gathering technique alone, it becomes a burden of contacting "old" cases for statistical purposes. But as part of the program--as an opportunity to be supportive and offer project aid--it could be viewed as an essential element of the staff's efforts and ultimately important in the project's long-term effectiveness. In short, the purposes of follow-up can be tied more closely to, and foster, project goals. In this perspective, the researcher

[12]GORDON, Jesse E., Dr.: Testing, Counseling and Supportive Services for Disadvantaged Youth, University of Michigan.

might envision monthly follow-ups of project participants. Increased frequency of attempted control group follow-ups, should increase the likelihood of this group's response.

The Employment Service

The data reported in the body of this paper has shown the proclivity of many variables to be related, and these variables to bear some relation to project success (favorable termination and non-recidivism). The Crossroads endeavor, for purposes of social policy planning, has had a relatively higher success rate (in terms of recidivism) with individuals who are older (20-24), have a background of relatively steady employment, and are high school graduates. The project also "reaches" a statistically significant greater proportion of females, as opposed to males, even when these females do not exhibit stable employment or educational credentials. Whether or not, in the case of females, this relates to arrest policy of law enforcement officials or type of criminal behavior engaged in, has been previously alluded to. Since males appear before the court in overwhelmingly larger numbers than do females, the bulk of this report, as well as emphasis in future projects, is directed to the male population.

The Crossroads approach--crisis intervention at first court appearance and provision of manpower services--has been shown to be least successful with those participants with extreme disadvantaged backgrounds, employment-wise and educationally, prior to Crossroads entrance, particularly the younger adults. This leads us to question the assumption that a basically employment-oriented approach, such as Crossroads provides, can be effective with all disadvantaged youths.

Although no data could be obtained for the juvenile population, other than the finding that the project had no effect on their recidivism, it is the researcher's impression that little success was possible with this group. It is quite possible that overall maturity is an important factor in success through an employment oriented program, and this may come with age, increased responsibilities (e.g., marriage) and experience (e.g., military training), and previous employment opportunities. This leads the researcher to speculate that individuals devoid of these characteristics and history might be assigned to a specific component within a project, which is designed to serve this group with a more intensive counseling effort, coupled with incentives for educational advancement and/or short-term job experience as part of a planned entrance into a stable career.

Apparently, the incentive to work, provided by the possibility of a nol-pros adjudication, is not strong enough to overcome those variables which work against success through employment for a small "hardcore" group. It is this researcher's recommendation that the entire question of "incentives" be reconsidered in planning for programs which aim at the least stable (or least "mature") group. Juveniles, especially, might need more of a perspective on how and where they fit into society before they can be expected to settle down with employment--and a program which is employment-oriented may not be the appropriate vehicle. Although the completion of a job training program by a small number of participants has been shown to be related to success in Crossroads, the problem to be tackled revolves around the many who start training programs but never finish. It might be important to undertake a special effort to analyze program failures, in an attempt to work with those individuals in most need of assistance. In short, the question of how to motivate and change the behavior of a hard-to-reach population which does not succeed in a program heavily oriented towards steady employment must lead us to reconceptualization of our traditional notions of "incentives" which becomes part of future program planning.

The Counseling Service

Little has been said in this paper about the work of the Crossroads counseling division. This is no way reflects upon the importance of the counseling operation, as it does upon: (1) a dearth of quantitative material; (2) limited researcher involvement with

day-to-day staff activities; and (3) an inability to isolate counseling from other project activities. No variation in counseling technique, nor major counseling philosophy, was structured into the project. The result was an inability to precisely evaluate the importance of the counseling operation as it relates to project success. While this researcher is of the opinion that this kind of variation was not called for in demonstrating the feasibility of the Crossroads concept, future projects should be structured to offer insights regarding counseling services (techniques, orientations) as well as counselor type ("new careers" versus professionals).

Many insights have already come from previous E & D projects: (1) counseling should not replace performance in life but should be a part of a larger set of services; (2) peer pressure seems more effective than pressure from staff in inducing attitude change; and (3) group counseling is practical and functional for getting across interview behavior, grooming, etc.[13] Although we have no way of quantitatively evaluating the impact of the counseling service as separate and distinct from that of the employment division, answers to the anonymous Participant Evaluation Form give every reason to believe that counseling plays a critically important role in the project.

This form was devised to obtain feedback on the project from the point of view of the recipient of its services. Distributed and returned anonymously at termination from the project, the completed forms do not distinguish between the 18- and 24-year old, the black or the white, the project success or the recidivist. There is reason to believe, though, that there is an overabundance of answers from favorably terminated individuals. A consensus on responses to questions emerges from 100 evaluation forms, giving a clear picture of the counselor and his services.

Question One asked: "What do you think is the most important thing your counselor does for you?" There is little doubt that the personal bond formed between counselor and participant--which is reflected in responses which cite "caring" about the participant as an individual, trying to understand his problems and just being there when needed--was strong and appreciated. Many of the answers indicate that apparently genuine concern shown by counselors on a continuing basis was important to the participant. Often mentioned was the notion of being helped to "get myself together," as were such specifics as being taken to a job interview and being helped in communicating with his family. Rarely mentioned were specifics regarding problem solving, per se (such as helping a participant with the court), which leads the researcher to believe that the quality of the relationship was more important than the problem solving aspects--although in reality, both are necessary.

The second question, which asked how the participant might do things differently if he were a counselor, revealed nearly complete satisfaction with the counselor. The majority of comments were related to spending more time with the participant, going deeper into problems, and enlarging the program so that more individuals could take advantage of it. A few comments indicated that the participant would like to be like his counselor.

Some of the comments would have it appear that this was the first time the participant was made to feel worthwhile as an individual. The following are offered to transmit the "feeling" quality of the remarks:

> "The counselor works with more as a human being, plus with the helping hand and voice (of) experience. They listen to the accused more fairly."
>
> "He has put a little more incouragement (sic) into me. Also for just one day a week and a little of your time your really think about what he is all about."
>
> "When she talks to me about my troubles, and I can let myself go, it seems like she understands."

[13]GORDON, op. cit.

"To me the most important thing ---------- does for me is to be a friend."

"I would get the participants more time to spend with me to show love and understanding and willingness to listen."

Questions related to the employment service reveal that although the staff might consider speed in finding a job, willingness of the employer to hire, and dependability of the employment service itself important, the participant was particularly impressed by the counselor's effort in his behalf. On the other hand, criticisms of the employment services were more often directed at the job market, as opposed to the service provided. Salary was rarely mentioned.

The Participant Evaluation Form is important in that it directs our gaze at the "secondary" benefits of the program--an improved feeling of self-worth for the participant and an image given by the program that there are people who care. Although it may sound overly sentimental to middle class readers who have been taught to put faith in the Protestant Ethic, the people-to-people approach of the counselors is an essential ingredient to the participants. This finding leads us to questions concerning abrupt program termination and the dichotomized counseling--employment division in services as they both relate to participant stability.

Counseling as Support

Individual comments of participants on the evaluation form lead the researcher to believe that the counselor is appreciated by many as a supportive figure. To further increase the impact of this service, increasing the frequency of counselor-participant contact is recommended, particularly for those participants with a background of failure: high school dropout, poor work history. These characteristics were found most frequently among the younger age group (18- and 19-year olds) of project participants, suggesting that a specific effort oriented toward that group is desirable.

This, of course, is related to the issue of counselor caseloads: more frequent counselor-participant contact might result in fewer cases handled. To some extent, group counseling might minimize this problem while at the same time providing a vehicle for peer contact as well as for information imparting by the counselor. Whether individuals are grouped according to stage of progress through the program or age or counselor, it might be adviseable for the more difficult to help group of participants as a supplement to individual counseling.

Although quantative documentation is not available, observations of the administrative and content aspects of the program leads the researcher to suggest that the counseling staff take more responsibility for employment counseling than engaged in at present. This would give the counselor more of a "task" purpose, in addition to his present supportive role. Greater counselor contact would be generated, resulting in a more comprehensive counselor-participant relationship.

Counselor as Role Model

The positive role model offered the participant by the staff, as interpreted from participant evaluation forms, leads this researcher to believe that the "new careers" person's value to the program cannot be overestimated. Also, the overrepresentation of black youth in the participant population, coupled with the pride-in-race movement and racial tension in urban areas, encourages the continuation of a predominantly black staff for this and similar programs. This would not necessarily sacrifice staff effectiveness with white participants; according to data from this study, there was no noticeable lack of success for white Crossroads participants. As it turned out, race-linked variables such as education, age, and employment were related to most trends. Other studies have already shown that a good "mix" was a multi-racial staff with a heavy proportion of counselors who are

of the same racial group as the participants.[14] Also, since an overwhelming number of males are handled by the courts, it is suggested that project services and staff apportionment continue being oriented to the male population.

Differential Services

The quantitative data included in the body of this paper leads us to believe that the differential needs of participants must be met through differential services. Whether this means a series of projects, each providing a different service to a specific population, or one project with component parts structured for special needs is a policy decision which is not within the purview of this paper.

The relative lack of success with the teenage population leads the researcher to believe that this group must be a priority target for future offender rehabilitation programs. Although we are not in a position to know all the reasons for continued failure, perhaps an experimental and demonstration program has the imperative of not allowing a person to fail--at least until it was very clear that the program cannot be of any help but after new insights were gained which will avoid the problem in the future. It must be remembered that failure in a program such as Crossroads is indicative of failures to follow.

Although the question of extending the term of project participation takes us into the problem of denying an accused offender a speedy trial, abrupt termination of a participant may not be beneficial for all participants. We have seen in Section IV that a proportion of favorably terminated participants recidivate after leaving Project Crossroads. Frequent follow-ups for a "marginal" group of participants might serve to provide consistency in support and reduce post-project recidivism.

To sum, the project is a "last chance" for many participants. "Giving up" on those who are more difficult to work with is taking the easy way out. It is suggested that even more resources be devoted to working with the most severely disadvantaged problem cases. While "success" statistics may not look as good in final evaluations, when this approach is taken, a program should be flexible and determined to put forth the greatest effort on behalf of the most difficult cases.

There is little doubt that the Crossroads effort was quite successful in reducing court case processing time and recidivism, and in increasing employment and related variables of wage and skill, for most of its participants. But the success was relative, and as the project presently functions it is more successful with those participants who were most stable upon project entrance. The project achieved least success with the youngest non-working, non-studying offenders. Efforts with juveniles were inconclusive. The following program modifications--extrapolated from findings and discussions contained within the paper--are offered to stimulate thinking, and not as a thoroughly reconceptualized approach to new programs.

The Employment Approach

Our data indicates that an employment oriented project is most suited for a relatively stable, older population. On the basis of evaluating a cluster of background characteristics (previously mentioned), a program of Crossroads' nature might be opened to first offenders ranging beyond the 26 years old group. Age is a variable which should help a person into the project as opposed to screening him out. The first offender status is expedient to retain in this manpower program by screening out "career" offenders.

---

[14]GORDON, op. cit.

The emphasis of the project must continue to center on employment and job training programs as economic alternatives to crime. Better training programs and opportunities, however, seem essential if economic stability is sought.

The Counseling Approach

Data indicate that Project Crossroads had a lesser impact on participants who have a poor work and school history. This is usually correlated with a younger age. The researcher interprets this data as indicating that the group was not "ready" for a program oriented towards regular, long-term employment. It has been previously noted that juveniles with prior arrest records comprised the larger segment of the recidivating juvenile population. It is speculated that the same would be true for adults with previous arrests, although the data were not available.

It is felt that this group is in need of an extensive and intensive counseling program (individual and group), job training and/or remedial education. Since incentive and motivation are important to success, it is quite conceivable that participants be paid when enrolled in a schooling or job training program and that nontraditional methods and variations be considered. For some participants, time will be needed for "growing up" to the demands of legitimate society. Whatever the need, this counseling approach would give the participant the time and supportive services necessary to work through personal and family problems, as well as those related to employment, without the pressure of a "real" job.

Although the technical first offender status is desirable for expediency, the charge criteria might be expanded for this group to involve those individuals (predominently youths) most in need of assistance. New approaches to project termination, follow-up, and counselor contact must be considered and have been alluded to in the early pages of this section.

A promising approach to working with this group might involve the availability of a residential facility. For many participants there is a need to be removed from home and neighborhood for a limited amount of time--particularly in conjunction with supportive services. The best concepts of the "therapeutic community," "behavior modification," and the "half-way house" might be incorporated into a trial facility.

The Educational Approach

A program designed with juvenile offenders in mind (14 through 17) could be similar to the above, with the emphasis placed on education. This program might best serve a juvenile population, a practical distinction in age categories which is necessitated by court administration. It is conceivable that work toward the GED would be encouraged through payments, and might take place as a program organized outside of the usual school context. Although this paper is not the proper vehicle for a program to work with juveniles, the approach which is recommended would emphasize extracting the best of existing knowledge and approaches of existing institutions which presently fail with juveniles, and establishing a program better suited to the needs of this special group.

CONCLUSION

Project Crossroads has succeeded in deterring recidivism and stabilizing employment for the large majority of its participants. Its success would be misunderstood and misplaced if it became a pre-packaged approach to delinquency and crime prevention. The data examined in the body of this report indicate the importance of using insights available from this experience, in conjunction with those gained from past experimental and demonstration projects, in order to modify program approaches to meet the differing needs of participants and locales.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Edward D. Greenwood, Chairman
Mrs. Thomas Herlihy, Jr., Vice Chairman
Mrs. Suzanne P. Jordan, Secretary
Mr. Charles B. Levinson, Treasurer
Mr. Philip E. Ryan, Assistant Treasurer
Dr. Lyle W. Ashby
Mrs. Rollin Brown
Mrs. A. D. Buchmueller
Dr. E. H. Christopherson
Mr. Richard J. Clendenen
Mr. Eli E. Cohen
Dr. Joseph H. Douglass
Mr. G. K. Hodenfield
Mrs. Clifford H. Jorgensen
Mrs. W. W. Lynch, Sr.
Colonel Belle Leach
Miss Alberta L. Meyer
Mr. Curtis Ray
Mr. David B. Ray, Jr.
Dr. Georgia B. Perkins Reaser
Mrs. Winthrop Rockefeller
Dr. Roland B. Scott
Dr. John Slawson
Mr. James R. Smith
Mr. Ray C. Votaw
Dr. Ruth Stout Wright
Mrs. Sara-Alyce Wright

******

Mrs. Isabella J. Jones, Executive Director
Mr. Sian S. Bong, Administrative Officer

******